



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/812,917 | 03/31/2004 | Michael Colin Begg | 34-125 | 5698 |
| 23117 | 7590 | 08/24/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203 | | | TUGBANG, ANTHONY D | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | | 3729 | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 08/24/2009 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Advisory Action

The After Final amendment filed on August 10, 2009 has been fully considered, entered, and made of record. The amendment does not raise any new issues.

Prior Art

Upon further consideration by the examiner, the rejections of now amended Claim 1 (which now includes the previous limitations of Claim 11) and Claim 6 (which now includes the previous limitations of Claim 7), have been withdrawn for the following reasons.

The prior art does not all of the limitations of the claimed invention including:

wherein the forming by punching step leaves bridging portions between lengths of conductive material in the cut pattern which lengths will form coil conductors in a finished MRIS shim coil;

said method further comprising removal of said bridging portions after attachment of the punched pattern to the substrate (as recited in Claim 1);

and

wherein said punch-cutting comprises: a first punch-cutting step wherein plural spaced-apart bridges of material are left along the cutting paths to physically maintain adjacent as-cut positions of conductive MRIS shim coil windings while said insulating substrate is adhered thereto, followed by a second cutting step wherein said bridges are cut off to completely form an electrical separation between adjacent winding conductors thus formed (as recited by Claim 6).

In the Final Rejection (mailed on March 10, 2009), each of the rejections of Claims 11 and 7 involved the combination of at least Hoppe et al, Takahashi, and LaPlante et al.

Upon further review of the merits of each of these references, the examiner has concluded the following. Takahashi does not teach “bridging portions between lengths of conductive material in the cut patter” or “plural spaced-apart bridges of material are left along the cutting paths”.

While Hoppe discloses forming bridging portions or spaced-apart bridges, Hoppe does not teach removal of the bridging portions *after* attachment of the punched pattern to the substrate, or does not teach a first punch-cutting step of the insulating substrate adhered to the spaced apart bridges, *followed by* a second cutting step where the bridges are cut off.

With LaPlante, there is no punching that forms the coil pattern with a punching-cutting step that leaves bridging portions between lengths of conductive material, and there is no first-punch cutting step to form spaced-apart bridges of material. In LaPlante the patterning is done by laser machining and not by punching.

So the combination of these references along with the AAPA, would not meet all of the limitations of Claim 1 and Claim 6 as now amended, for the reasons set forth above.

Restriction Requirement

Claims 5 and 10 are still directed to the invention of Group II based upon the Restriction Requirement of April 5, 2006. Therefore, **Claims 5 and 10 remain as withdrawn**.

However, Claims 8 and 9 have been rejoined with Claims 1 and 6. The applicant(s) specification contains one embodiment that supports Claims 6, 8 and 9 in one group.

Accordingly, **Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9 are allowed**.

Informalities

As result of the rejoining of Claims 8 and 9 with Claim 6, some informalities still remain with the claim language and the examiner suggests amending the claims as follows, to merely correct the grammar.

In Claim 1, "by punching step" (line 7) should be replaced with --of the MRIS shim coil by punching--; and "which" (line 8) should be replaced with --in which the--.

In Claim 6, "said bridges" (line 12) should be replaced with --said spaced-apart bridges--; and "adjacent winding conductors" (line 13) should be replaced with --the adjacent MRIS shim coil windings--.

In Claim 8, "cutting" (line 1) should be replaced with --punch-cutting--; and "of conductive" (line 2) should be replaced with --of electrically conductive--.

In Claim 9, "cutting" (line 1) should be replaced with --punch-cutting--; "of conductive" (line 2) should be replaced with --of electrically conductive--; "the conductive material" (line 3) should be replaced with --the remaining portions of conductive material--.

The above changes to the claims, as well as the cancellation of non-elected claims 5 and 10, would place the application in condition for allowance.